AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Replace the drawings previously in the case with the accompanying new drawings.

REMARKS

The necessary new drawings are submitted herewith.

The objection to the drawings in that they do not show all of the claimed subject matter, is taken care of by the new claims, which recite only properly illustrated subject matter.

The new claims have included a new basic claim 10, which is similar to a combination of previous claims 1, 4 and 5. (New claims 11 and 12 replicate original claims 2 and 3).

Reconsideration is accordingly respectfully requested, for the rejection of the claims as anticipated by or unpatentable over WITLER et al., alone or in view of PROVOST.

PROVOST was applied only with respect to claims 6-9, now canceled, and so need not be discussed in greater detail at this time.

WITLER relates only to the determination of the speed of a golf ball in flight. Therefore, the radar which is shown in Figures 2 and 3 of WITLER, is positioned to monitor the golf ball, not the golf club.

New claim 10 requires that the radar device detects the swing speed of the golf club head. See page 4, line 18 et seq. of our specification for the support for this feature.

According to the present invention, the actual speed of the golf club must be detected, since the variable threshold setting of the directional microphone signal is based on the amplitude of the signal from the radar device.

WITLER does not teach this nor suggest it. In fact, WITLER explicitly states in column 12, line 18 et seq., that "the discriminator circuitry is designed so that it does not 'see' club head speed". Furthermore, in column 14, line 22 et seq., WITLER says that "the golfing apparatus 20 does not use club head speed". WITLER therefore does not and cannot detect golf club head speed, as in the present invention, and thus is not suitable for detecting when a golf ball is hot off a golf tee of an automatic golf ball teeing machine, as required by new claim 10.

WITLER also does not suggest that the amplitude of the first signal of the radar device be adjusted, but only that the sensitivity of the acoustic trigger be altered, depending on the switch which selects the type of club being used. New claim 10 requires that the predetermined level of the second signal (i.e. the acoustic signal) is varied in accordance with the amplitude of the first signal. This is not suggested in any way by WITLER and there is no reason why this would be considered an obvious step, as WITLER relates to monitoring the speed of a golf ball only.

Notice also that in WITLER's column 13, line 60 et seq., it is stated that a putter cannot be used with the apparatus. Again, this indicates that WITLER is unsuitable for ball detection apparatus for detecting when a golf ball is hot off a tee of an automatic golf ball teeing machine. In other words, the present invention is suitable for use with any type of

golf club, because it relates to an entirely different concept than WITLER.

The allowable subject matter recited above is brought out in claim 10 with ample particularity and distinctness, whereby the application is thus placed in condition for allowance.

New claims 11 and 12 depend from and hence are allowable with new claim 10.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Robert J. Patch, Reg. No. 17,355
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

RJP/lrs

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item:

- replacement drawing sheet